



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

to prevent anything of the nature of misunderstanding or bad feeling on this occasion, and that the Conference should have a real and practical value."

Turning to the question of the Drago doctrine, Mr. de Martens said:

"This matter has provoked some misunderstanding and bad feeling. If the Drago doctrine is to form a guarantee that any power need not pay its debts, naturally it will not evoke very much sympathy, and from this point of view it will not be approved. Even in the United States the Drago doctrine was accepted by Mr. Hay, the late Secretary of State, with considerable reserve. If, on the other hand, the Drago doctrine will have the effect of referring to The Hague, instead of settling by force, questions which can be adjusted by arbitration, it cannot be otherwise than very useful."

Asked as to his views concerning the results of the Conference, Mr. de Martens remarked:

"I should say that my mission is not connected with the utopian ideas of eternal and permanent peace which seem to exist in some quarters. Such a matter must be left for the future. I am looking quite hopefully to the results of the Conference, because this will be the first occasion on which the civilized nations of the world have met together in a time of peace, not as the result of force but of their own free will, to legislate on their mutual relations. This is a great and noteworthy fact and shows that they are coming together under circumstances quite unknown in the history of international relations. I have, as I have said, the best hopes as to the results, but of course one cannot guarantee them, and some skepticism is perhaps unavoidable. All the questions to be put before the Conference have in view the matter of peace — the peace of the world.

"The first half of the program concerns especially means for the prevention of war by international inquiry, meditation, or arbitration. The second part has in view the limitation of the operations of war, by defining as far as is practicable the rights and duties of neutrals. It is really in the interests of all the nations of the world that the safety of navigation and commerce, which in time of war is always endangered, should be guaranteed in a much better fashion than has hitherto been the case.

"It is expected that the Conference will meet at The Hague in the middle of June and will probably sit for two months."

From this statement it is clear that the governments are looking forward with great interest to the Conference, that they will all be represented in it, that two important classes of questions will be by general agreement taken up and discussed, and that the only subject which has been proposed for discussion on which there is hesitation and disagreement is the subject of limitation of armaments.

Mr. de Martens has, since leaving London, visited The Hague, Rome and Vienna, and he may have discovered that in the meantime the subject of limitation of armaments has ripened a good deal. For the British Prime Minister has since declared anew, in

the most unequivocal terms, that it is the purpose of his government to have this subject discussed in the Conference, if it is at all possible. Italy, it is well known, stands solidly with the British government in this matter, and there is strong ground to believe now that our own government will do so likewise. If, therefore, the subject is not put upon the program in advance, it will be introduced when the Conference meets. And when it comes up, not only the majority of the great powers, but all the small powers, will range themselves with Great Britain, and the subject will be voted a practical one of the first order. The subject is too urgent, and too deep and widespread an interest is taken in it, to permit one easily to believe that it will be kept out of the Conference, because two or three powers think it not ripe.

Meanwhile the people in all the countries are being heard from, on the four or five great subjects which the Conference ought to consider, and as the voice of the people saved the first Hague Conference from failure and made it an unexpected and far-reaching success, so it will be again, in far greater measure, we do not doubt, when the representatives of *all the nations of the world* meet at The Hague in June, look into each other's faces and feel the mighty mandate of humanity resting upon them.

### The Japanese Once More.

The San Francisco school trouble over the Japanese children has been settled,—apparently; but the settlement has revealed the true purpose of the San Franciscans in bringing on the crisis, namely, hereafter to keep the Japanese workmen out altogether. If the compromise agreed upon by President Roosevelt and the California delegation, and proposed to be embodied in the new treaty with Japan, shall be carried out, as the Californians evidently wish, in such a way as finally to exclude from the country all Japanese laborers both unskilled and skilled, the final result will be that but few Japanese will be left in the State. Nearly all of the Japanese who come over to our western coast are of these two classes. The San Francisco school authorities will therefore have had their way in spite of President Roosevelt's efforts, or rather with his coöperation. The opening of the schools again to the Japanese children will mean next to nothing, for in time there will be almost no Japanese children to enter them.

The whole boasted settlement seems to us one that settles nothing. It is a settlement on an iniquitous basis. Mutually to exclude from the two countries all laborers both unskilled and skilled, or to put it into the President's hands to do this for our country, in the case of those traveling abroad with passports, is radically and flagrantly wrong. It is against the fundamental principles of human

rights, liberties and equalities. It is essentially an insult to the entire class of workingmen, in this country as well as Japan. Upright, well-behaved workingmen, whether skilled or unskilled, have the same right to travel from their country, to reside abroad and engage in employment and change their residence from one country to another, as people of any other class. No fine-spun theory of "standard of living" can take away this right. Governments have no right, at no matter whose behest, to put any such restrictions and marks of inferiority upon any class of citizens as it is proposed in a new treaty with Japan to put upon the working class of the two countries.

The agreement reached and embodied in the immigration bill and proposed to be put into the new treaty has had of course as its aim to quiet the excitement growing out of the action of the San Francisco school board in segregating the Japanese pupils, and to preserve undisturbed the friendship of Japan. That is a most laudable purpose. But the method employed is likely to make the last state of the case worse than the first. Friendship is neither produced nor maintained in such wise. The Japanese are already protesting against the exclusion proposed. They would be less worthy of our respect and friendship than they are if they did not protest against it. The American working men are also protesting against the stigma of inferiority put upon them. If the course is persisted in, the whole body of the Japanese people, in spite of the Mikado, will become deeply disaffected against our country. Their confidence in the President, which has persisted during the recent disturbance, will break down, and a state of feeling will settle down in Japan like that in China growing out of Chinese exclusion, which produced the recent widespread boycott of American goods. Nothing could be more disastrous than this to our national honor and to our reputation for love of liberty and justice.

One of the most deplorable features of the situation is that a fresh opportunity will thus be given to the war-howlers to seduce the nation further into the ways of militarism and naval expansion. They have been busy through the recent disturbance. They have for the moment forgotten their dread of Germany. They have been absolutely sure that we cannot escape a war with Japan, for the commercial supremacy of the Pacific — as sure as if they had seen the Japanese shells already tumbling into the Pacific coast cities. Men in Congress, who pretend to be grave and serious, when the naval bill came up the other day, made this coming war with Japan the basis of impassioned pleas for two *Dreadnaughts*. But for this boggy, which was hung up like a black, ragged scarecrow in the House by Mr. Weeks and others, it is almost certain that Mr. Burton's motion to strike out the second *Dreadnaught* from the naval bill —

which received 114 votes as it was — would have had a good majority.

The new feeling of dislike for our country awakened in Japan by the proposed exclusion from our shores of Japanese workmen will inflame the imaginations of these men and whet their appetites for more battleships. They will keep the country distracted, if they can, with further visions of yellow invasions, while they saddle upon the backs of the unwary taxpayers new burdens for the enlarged armaments which they are determined to have. What makes the influence of these war-mongers capable of doing such abundant mischief in the country is a certain penchant for war scares among the people. This has come down by heredity from the past, and is liable to flame up in a moment like a tinder box when the least spark falls upon it. This is one of the worst legacies to us of the wars and war-spirit of the past.

It has been depressing to see what a large number of the people have, because of this weakness, been led away by the totally irrational talk of war with Japan. It has been in the newspapers, on the lecture platforms, on the streets, in private circles. And the men who are determined that the United States navy shall be the biggest on earth, who go about frightening audiences with war-bogies, will take immediate advantage of the righteous protests made by the Japanese against having their working class excluded from our shores. The return of a few Japanese boys to the San Francisco schools will not stop their mouths. Japan will loom more terrible than ever before them, and by their cries of alarm they will seduce the public into supporting their absurd naval schemes, and next winter they will be on hand in Washington beseeching the Representatives of the people to give them one more *Dreadnaught*, that we may be ready for Japan, when she comes upon us "in such an hour as we think not."

### The Interparliamentary Union and its Work.

The Interparliamentary Union, of which so much is heard nowadays in connection with the movement for world-peace, is an association of members and ex-members of the various Parliaments of the world for the promotion of arbitration and better relations among the nations generally. It began nearly twenty years ago in the special interest taken in the subject by William Randal Cremer, a member of the British House of Commons. At first working quietly and patiently at home, he was instrumental in 1887 in causing a memorial to be presented by members of the British Parliament to the President and Congress of the United States in support of arbitration. This was followed by a similar memorial from France expressing the wish that a treaty of arbitration might be signed between that country and ours.